```
1
 2
 3
                INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION OF ARIZONA
 4
 5
                         PUBLIC HEARING
 6
                                 ON
 7
                        PROPOSED RULEMAKING
8
              REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
9
10
11
                         Phoenix, Arizona
                           June 5, 2017
                             9:00 A.M.
14
15
16
17
18
   REPORTED BY:
    Teri L. Veres, RMR
19
    Certified Reporter (AZ 50687)
20
21
22
23
24
    (COPY)
25
```

```
INDEX
1
2
   BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:
 3
   JAMES ASHLEY
 5
   JASON PORTER
   LISA PADGET
 6
 7
   COURTNEY HAYDEN
   SCOTT COOLEY
 8
 9
10
   PUBLIC SPEAKERS:
11
   DENISE BLOMMEL
    JAY ZWEIG
12
    HEIDI NUNN-GILMAN
13
    SANDRA PORTNEY
14
    DEBRA NOVAK-SCOTT
15
16
    HEIDI KOLTON
17
    CHRIS WINKLER
    JILL CHASSON
18
19
    FRANK PICCIOLI
    ABE ARVIZU, JR.
20
    JENNIFER GRONDAHL
21
22
23
24
25
```

## PROCEEDINGS

\* \*

 $\sqrt{12}$ 

1.8

MR. PORTER: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the oral proceeding regarding the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking regarding amendment of Title 20, Chapter 5, Article 12, specifically Rule 20-5-1201, 1202, 1205, 1206, 1208, 1209, 1210, 1211, 1213 and 1218.

My name is Jason Porter. I'm the Chief Counsel of the Industrial Commission. With me is James Ashley, Director of the Industrial Commission; Scott Cooley, staff attorney; Lisa Padget, Investigation Supervisor in the Labor Department; and Courtney Hayden, Program Product Specialist in the Labor Department.

This will be your opportunity to present the Industrial Commission with your oral comments regarding a proposed rulemaking as published in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

By short way of summary, Arizona voters approved Proposition 206, the Fair Wages and Healthy Families Act, in November 2016. The Act established a new State minimum wage effective January 1st, 2017, and entitles employees to approve earned paid sick time beginning July 1st, 2017.

The Act authorizes the Industrial Commission of Arizona to enforce and implement both the minimum wage and earned paid sick time provisions and to promulgate regulations consistent with the articles.

In the earned paid sick time context, the Act provides quote, "The Commission shall be authorized to coordinate implementation and enforcement of Article 8.1, Earned Paid Sick Time, and shall promulgate appropriate guidelines or regulations for such purposes."

Currently, the rules in Article 12 -implemented in 2007 after the referendum that created
the Arizona Minimum Wage Act -- address only those
procedures relating to the enforcement and
implementation of minimum wage law. Because the
Commission is now statutorily tasked with
implementing, enforcing, and regulating the Act's
earned paid sick time provision, the Commission is
proposing to amend existing rules in Article 12 to be
consistent with the Act's new provisions.

In addition, the proposed rulemaking conforms the independent contractor analysis to factors outlined in A.R.S. \$23-902(D) and 23-1601(B); defines "small employer" and exempts "small employers"

from posting requirements; and amends Rule 20-5-1209 to conform to current technologies and includes various non-substantive amendments.

 $\sqrt{12}$ 

The proposed rulemaking is primarily intended to be responsive to the Act and, as such, the Commission anticipates that the rulemaking will create minimum -- minimal economic, small business or consumer impact beyond that already created by the Act.

To the extent the proposed rulemaking creates any impact beyond the Act, the Commission anticipates that the proposed amendments will reduce regulatory burden on businesses by aligning Article 12 with current Arizona statutes and providing clarification that reduces uncertainty for Arizona businesses and employees.

The Notice of Proposed Rulemaking was published in the May 5th, 2017, Arizona Administrative Register at Volume 23, Issue 18, beginning on Page 1019. Copies of the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, as published in the Register, are available outside the door.

Those wishing to speak may do so by filling out a speaker slip, which is also available at the door. I will call each speaker, who will have

five minutes to present. Although the oral proceedings will end when oral comments have concluded, written comments will be accepted until 5:00 o'clock p.m. today, at which time the public comment period will end.

The Commission will carefully consider all written comments, along with your oral comments. The Commission will discuss and take action on the proposed rules at a regular public meeting of the Commission.

Please keep in mind that this oral proceeding is for the Commission to receive public comment on the proposed rulemaking, not on the provisions of the Fair Wages and Healthy Families Act.

If you have specific questions about the Act, the Commission has previously posted an extensive list of Frequently Asked Questions on the website addressing common questions about the Act and the proposed rules.

In the event the FAQs do not answer your questions, we would advise you to submit questions to directly to Steve Welker, the Manager of our Labor division. Mr. Welker's e-mail address and phone number are available on the Commission's website.

With that, we will now open the floor to public comment, and we will begin with Denise Blommel.

MS. BLOMMEL: Good morning.

MR. PORTER: Good morning.

My name is Denise

Blommel, and I'm an attorney in Scottsdale. I represent both employers and employees in my labor law practice. I am very concerned about the FAQs and whether we can rely upon them pursuant to A.R.S.

BLOMMEL:

MS.

11 23-365.

That law, as you well know, permits reliance upon substantive interpretation of the law by the Industrial Commission and enforcement guidance, and I am concerned because the FAQs, which are excellent, by the way, and you're to be commended for doing a good job on those, they do have a disclaimer on them, however; and so my main concern is, can we rely upon them.

I also have another huge concern dealing with Worker Compensation, and that is this:

If an employee is going to be granted earned paid sick time for taking off a few days because of an industrial injury, does the employer have the right to request medical information from that employee with

respect to return to work?

I think that the law permits this, but it would be very, very good for the Commission to address this in the rules.

Additionally, when an employee is off work on earned paid sick time under the Americans with Disabilities Act, the employer does have the obligation to -- if the employee is disabled, to enter into what is called the interactive process under federal law; and so the question is with the provisions of the Fair Wages and Healthy Families Act, it's a "don't ask, don't tell" type of situation, unless the employee is gone for three consecutive work days, and I think under the ADA there may be issues.

The same thing is true with intermittent leave under the Federal Family Medical Leave Act. So, again, some guidance from the Commission, whether in rules or in FAQs that we can rely on under A.R.S. 23-365 would be in order.

I think the biggest question that my employer clients have for me is dealing with carry-over, and the question there -- and I think you've tried to address this in the rules with respect to limiting carry-over to 40 hours.

However, the problem is, is many

employers out there are more generous, and so the carry-over may be more; and the big question I get from a lot of employer clients is, "Well, our people already have this huge bank of sick leave. What do we do with it?" et cetera.

 $\sqrt{12}$ 

So I think that a possibility for the Commission would be to address this in terms of defining the term "available" as that term appears in the statute. What is available?

A big question that I get, again from my employer clients is: Well, if they have 80 hours available or 120 hours available and whatever, they can only use 40, this creates confusion for the employee, but it also creates confusion for the employer.

So I -- I understand, I think, what you're trying to accomplish with limiting on that 40 hours for the carry-over, but I think the better possibility may be to define the term "available" with respect to those kinds of things.

There are some other questions and concerns I have, which appear in my written comments to the Commission. I'm happy to answer any questions you have of me.

MS. HAYDEN: I don't think at this

point that we have any questions directly, but thank 1 you for your feedback, and we'll certainly take it --2 3 take it into account. Okay, thank you very 4 MS. BLOMMEL: 5 much. PORTER: Thank you very much. 6 MR. 7 Our next request to speak -- and this is the last one I have. So if there are any among the 8 group that would like to speak, if you can go ahead 9 10 and fill out a Request to Speak form, I think Kara Dimas, our -- the Commission secretary, has additional 11 copies in the back.  $\sqrt{12}$ 13 With that, our next comment will be 14 from Mr. Jay Zweig. ZWEIG: Good morning, Director, 15 counsel, and staff. A few questions and comments and, 16 one, I'll start with the carry-over issue as well. 17 would be interested in some feedback from the panel 18 about how carry-over, if an employer chooses to pay it 19 out, affects accrual rights and the employer needing 20 21 to reset the availability after payout. 22 As I read that, there's -- there's a 23 little bit of an issue there that if you pay this out 24 at the end of the year to take it off your books as a

liability for an employer, then you may have an

```
obligation to immediately reset if the employee the
1
2
   next day at the beginning of the next year says,
3
   "Well, I want to take sick leave."
                    MR. PORTER:
                                  Then I believe that Prop
4
   206 addresses that question. It gives employers the
5
   opportunity to pay out a balance of unused and accrued
6
7
   earned paid sick time, but require that company
   employers who do that restock, essentially, a bank of
8
   earned paid sick time that would be available for the
9
10
   employee to use in the -- in the following year, at
   the beginning of the year. I believe Prop 206
11
   addresses that question specifically, but that --
12
13
   that's an option for employers.
                     MR. ZWEIG:
                                 So you -- you pay it
14
15
   out --
                         PORTER:
                                  Uh-huh.
16
                     MR.
17
                     MR.
                         ZWEIG:
                                 -- and what's the
   incentive, then, to pay it out if you're restocking
18
   and how does the rule address that?
19
                     MR. PORTER:
                                  I don't believe that our
20
21
   rules address that particular issue, although in the
22
   carry-over provision of the proposed rules, it does
23
   mention that employers have the opportunity to pay out
24
   pursuant to that provision in -- in the statute.
25
                     Outside of mentioning that that's an
```

```
option to employers, I don't believe that the proposed
   rulemaking addresses or intended to address that issue
   any further.
                        ZWEIG:
                                 From the Commission's
                    MR.
   perspective, what is the incentive, then, for an
   employer to pay it out?
                    MR. PORTER:
                                  I'm not sure if that's
   an appropriate question for the Commission.
   Commission didn't draft Proposition 206.
                                              It was a
   voter initiative, as -- as we all know.
                    We've carefully looked at the
   carry-over provision in -- in the statute and there
   seems to be -- that the statute provides for
   carry-over, subject to uses limitations and,
14
   alternatively, gives employers the option to pay out,
15
   and if they do, to restock.
16
                    Reasons that an employer may choose
17
   to do one or the other are further beyond the purview
18
   of -- of the Commission, I believe.
19
                     MR. ZWEIG:
                                 Okay.
20
21
                     DIRECTOR ASHLEY: And also,
22
   Mr. Zweig --
23
                     MR.
                         ZWEIG:
                                 Zweig, FYI.
24
                     DIRECTOR ASHLEY:
                                       Zweig, thank you.
25
                     MR.
                        ZWEIG:
                                 That's fine.
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

```
DIRECTOR ASHLEY:
                                        This is good --
1
2
   good comment and feedback, and we would encourage you,
   if you haven't already, to submit written comments
3
4
   that can be considered to incorporate into the
5
   proposed rulemaking as well.
 6
                     MR. ZWEIG:
                                  Absolutely, thank you.
 7
                     I -- I look at this as an interactive
   process with the Commission and appreciate the
8
9
   opportunity.
                     The -- the next question that I had
10
   had to do with Paragraph 19 under 20-5-1202, and
11
   that's calculating the regular hourly rate.
                                                   Let --
\sqrt{12}
   let everyone get there, but it includes under
13
   Subsection (d) for employees paid on a commission and
14
   then, as I read it, goes on to describe that you need
15
   to have a reasonable estimate of the wages they would
16
                Am -- am I reading that correctly?
17
   have made.
18
                     MR.
                          PORTER:
                                   I'm sorry, where?
                                                       Where
              Are you in --
19
   are you?
                         ZWEIG:
                                  I'm under --
20
                     MR.
21
                     MR.
                          PORTER:
                                   Are you under the
   proposed rule?
22
                                  Yes, I'm under
23
                     MR.
                          ZWEIG:
24
    R20-5-1202
25
                     MR.
                          PORTER:
                                   19?
```

MR. ZWEIG: -- Paragraph 19(d) at the bottom of the page there. It includes employees paid on a commission, and if those employees take sick time accrued -- maybe I should just start with the question: How's an employer to calculate an employee who's on a hundred percent commission, what they would have earned for the period they're taking as sick time?

 $\sqrt{12}$ 

<sup>2</sup>25

MR. PORTER: And -- and your question, the intent of Paragraph 19 in defining "same hourly rate," particularly subdivision -- subpart (d) is to provide employers some guidance on how they do that when it comes to a commission or piece-rate or fee-for-service employee.

In particular, there are four -- four possible ways to determine what "same hourly rate" means, and they should be used in the order of priority that they're listed.

So the first would be the hourly rate of pay agreed upon by the employer and employee, if an hourly rate of pay was previously established. So if an employer and employee have agreed on what the hourly rate will be, say, at the commencement of employment, then that will be -- that will be binding and the Commission will defer do that.

If that hasn't happened, it will be the wages that the employer would have been paid, if known, for the period of time in which the earned paid sick time was used. If unknown, then an employer would look to subpart (iii), a reasonable estimation of the wages that the employee would have been paid for the period of time in which the earned paid sick time was used.

And then if that's not possible, the last option is the weighted average of all hourly rate of pay during the previous 90 days, if the employee worked regularly during the previous 90 days.

options when they have employees that don't have set or established wages where the wages may vary depending on commissions or fee-for-service options to pursue in order to calculate what the reasonable rate of pay should be for an employee that is using earned paid sick time.

MR. ZWEIG: And I appreciate that explanation. I'll just carry my example a little bit farther.

MR. PORTER: Okay.

MR. ZWEIG: Let's say that the employee is outside sales. So they're exempt,

correct, and they're a hundred percent commission. I don't want to answer my own question. So based on that, that employee understands and the agreement is, "You don't make a sale, you don't earn wages, you're exempt, outside sales."

 $\sqrt{12}$ 

<sup>2</sup>25

How would this proceed when the employee says, "I want to take one of my paid sick days"?

MR. PORTER: So -- so, again, I think that the answer is -- is found within the language of subpart (d). So if -- if the employer and the employee in that circumstance have negotiated an hourly rate of pay that will be used for earned paid sick time purposes and they agree upon that, then that can be used. If not, then you would resort to the next provision.

So in your example, assuming subpart (i) isn't satisfied, subpart (ii), the wages that the employee would have been paid, if known. I assume they aren't known because they're a hundred percent commission employed. Moving to (iii), a reasonable estimation, assuming that you couldn't estimate because their, you know, wages fluctuate so much, you would resort to the last provision there, which is the weighted average of all hourly rates of pay in the

```
previous 90 days.
                 MR.
                     ZWEIG:
                             And assume then -- again,
I'll just finish the question -- they don't have
               They make a commission based on a sale.
hourly rates.
So you're saying take -- the rule is saying take the
pay period, divide it into an hourly wage?
                 MR.
                     PORTER:
                              Correct.
                 MR.
                     ZWEIG:
                             Okay. For over the last
90 days?
                 MR.
                     PORTER:
                              Correct.
                 MR.
                     ZWEIG:
                             And what's the reasoning
behind that rule?
                 MR. PORTER:
                              So when you're dealing
with a commissioned employee or an employee who's paid
piece-rate or fee-for-service, it's difficult to
assign particular a rate of pay for a period of time
that hasn't been worked; and so the Commission was
simply trying to propose rules that would provide
employers some clarity on how to do that calculation
for those types of employees, you know, in a fair way
for both employers and employees.
                 And if the prior provisions (i), (ii)
and (iii) aren't possible, we think that the most
reasonable way to calculate a rate of pay is to look
historically and average out a commissioned employee's
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

.12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

pay, over a 90-day period is what we've -- we've selected here, average it out to figure out what their rate of pay has been, and then to use that number for the time that they are taking off for earned paid sick time.

≥25

MR. ZWEIG: And -- and I'll just ask my last question on this one, and I really appreciate the effort to answer it, but when you have a fully commissioned outside salesperson, their hours are -- are not tracked, right, under the FLSA. It -- it doesn't matter if they work five hours or they work 55 hours in a week.

So I would just ask -- I can understand you'd say, "Well, take what commission they earned over the 90-day period and figure out the hourly rate," but where's the other half of the equation?

Are we asking the employers for those employees to assume a 40-hour week or assume a 50-hour week or a 30-hour week? I -- I think it's -- it's open to a lot of interpretation and some potential disputes. So, any response to that or is that something that --

MR. PORTER: It's a -- it's an issue that I haven't given thought to. It's -- it's a good

question and it's certainly one that we can consider as we're reviewing this rulemaking and perhaps FAQ as well to determine whether we can give some further clarity to those types of employees.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ZWEIG: Okay, thank you.

And, you know, I'm sorry, I probably have already exceeded my time. Could I ask one more question?

MR. PORTER: You sure can.

MR. ZWEIG: The most significant issue -- and I think this is back to the statute, Mr. Director and panel -- is for employers who have historically offered paid time off policies where they have said, "We don't want to track other than for Federal law, Family Medical Leave Act, or whatever purposes, or you've been gone a certain period of time and we need to ask, 'Are you okay to return? Can you do your job with reasonable accommodation?' But other than that, we're giving you a block of time, either you accrue it or you grant it at the start of the year, and we're calling it paid time off, and we combine vacation, sick time, personal time, et cetera."

And as someone who represents mediumto large-size employers, most employers have something like this in excess of a week a year, and often it's several weeks a year, depending on seniority, and what we're finding is that the Act -- and, again, this is back to the Act, but the Act is wreaking some challenge on those employers with existing paid time off policies as to what they should do.

Do they need to cut back on the paid time off and have a second category, earned paid sick time? Can they modify their existing paid time off policies? And, again, I realize that's kind of out of the purview of the Commission in terms of what individual employers do.

You're trying to give guidance, which we appreciate, but I'm just wondering if the Commission has had other inquiries about that and has taken any steps to implement the intent of the Act, which apparently was to address employers who provide nothing or too little to people who need time off when they're ill or one of the other circumstances.

So, again, what would you say to those employers who have paid time off policies where they're granted at least a week of time? Yet, you could have a circumstance where the employee takes two weeks of vacation at the start of the year that they accrued and then says, "Well, now, I'm ill. I want

```
1
   paid sick time," and the employer says, "Well, we
2
   already gave you two weeks."
3
                     So, again, I realize the statute and
   in the rulemaking you have some very specific tracking
4
   that employers need to do, but are there any
5
6
   suggestions or thought that was given in the
7
   rulemaking as to how employers who already grant this
8
   benefit are not unfairly impacted?
9
                     MR. PORTER:
                                  Yeah, and Court -- I
   guess Courtney and Lisa in our Labor Department are
10
11
   taking phone calls basically all day, every day --
12
                     MR. ZWEIG:
                                 Sure.
13
                     MR. PORTER:
                                  -- if they're here in
14
   the office.
15
                     MS. HAYDEN:
                                  Yeah.
16
                     MR. PORTER:
                                  So I'll defer to them.
17
                     Are we receiving questions on this
   PTO issue?
18
19
                     MS. HAYDEN:
                                  Sure, but first I want
20
   to say I'm -- I'm sympathetic to the areas that you're
21
   raising. You're not the only one who has.
22
                     What I can say from -- from my view
   is I keep detailed records of the calls that I receive
23
24
   and those concerns that people raise, and then dually
25
   they are provided to the people on that half of the
```

table. So certainly, we're -- we're keeping it in mind.

MR. PORTER: And I -- if I'm right, and, Courtney, you can correct me, I believe there were a couple of our FAQs that have addressed the issue of PTOs where employers give their employees a stock of time that can be used for earned paid sick time purposes in compliance with the provisions of the Act, but can also be used for other purposes.

MS. HAYDEN: Yes.

MR. PORTER: And I believe our FAQ has indicated that that's acceptable.

MS. HAYDEN: It's allowable. So the FAQs indicate that an employer can use a PTO program, as long as it meets or exceeds all of the minimum mandates of the law. So not to bore you with what I would say on the telephone, but I always put that with a caveat you want to make sure that all of the minimum mandates are met, but I do want to make sure that time is available for the use as stipulated.

There's really specific information regarding domestic violence. You want to make sure that posting, notification, some of those requirements, as it stands currently, for details on the pay -- the pay stubs. All of those need to be met

as well, but there is an allowance for an adoption of a PTO program that meets or exceeds the expectation.

.12

MR. ZWEIG: And -- and, again, I'll just -- I really do appreciate those responses. How would you address the response that says, "Okay, we're just renaming our PTO policy. We're now calling it the earned paid sick time policy plus," and the employee gets -- we'll make it simple -- a week a year, all right, and they have -- they're into the year, they've accrued it, they have it.

And they say, "Well, since it's the earned paid sick time plus, formally known as PTO, I want to take a week of vacation." So they take a week of vacation. They tell the employer it's vacation, but it's a PTO policy that met the requirements because it was available for paid sick time and you put it on the pay stub that way.

But then the employee comes back from vacation and they're ill. They say, "I picked up something on vacation," or two weeks later, "I'm ill. I want to use sick time now, and that time I used before was vacation time, not sick time. So you haven't complied. I'm heading down to the Commission or going to call Courtney."

So I'm just not sure that the FAQs

address that, and, again, I realize this may be a statutory issue, but I'm wondering what plans there are to clarify that, because I think there is a lot of confusion with employers who are just saying, "Well, we have a PTO policy, we're fine."

MS. HAYDEN: So -- so I hear you, first and foremost. Secondarily, I want you to know that as long as the investigation's going, I'm going to take a common sense approach. We understand we're still in the process of really flushing this out.

That being said, at risk of repeating what I said and not meeting it to the full extent of your question, as an investigator I -- I'm looking at every -- every single mandate. So whether you call it the earned paid sick time plus or however you want to name it and however an employer wants to work with their counsel to ensure that each bucket of that minimum mandate is met, I'm just going to be looking at each individual area as a -- as a specific.

So -- so in terms of giving an overall purview of -- from this purview of is it acceptable? Is it going to meet the requirement? I don't think that I could say, per se. However, you can see everyone, you know, closely reviewing as we speak, and so I know that this is an area that we're

going to dive into with some depth moving forward. MR. PORTER: And I should say I believe one of our FAQs does address the precise question that you're asking, which is if an employer provides their employee with, let's say, 40 hours of earned paid sick time or EPST plus policy, and that time can be used for any of the reasons outlined in the Act, but can also be used for additional reasons, like vacation, and an employee chooses to use that time for vacation, does the employer need to provide additional time for earned paid sick time? And I believe that our FAQs say that they don't, as long as an employee is provided the required amount of time per the statute for purposes outlined in the statute and has that opportunity and chooses to use it for some other reason, that an employer wouldn't be required. Now, keep in mind an employer can always exceed the requirements of the Act, but they wouldn't be required to provide further earned paid sick time for that employee in that year. MR. ZWEIG: And how would you recommend that that be reported on the pay stub? MR. PORTER: It's -- it's an excellent question. I don't think that we've --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

have an answer for that right now, but based on the Commission's guidance on that issue, I think it's appropriate for us to think about that question more and perhaps supplement that FAQ to provide some guidance to employers on how to document use of PTO time that's available for earned paid sick time purposes that's used for other purposes. MR. ZWEIG: And -- and at this point, the guidance is if you as an employer are committed that -- we'll just take the employers who give one week. If you're committed to say, "You can use it for all of the reasons under the Act, but you could also use it for -- attend a funeral or vacation or purposes that aren't outlined under the Act," if you addend those to the earned paid sick time policy that's required under the Act and the employee uses them for the purposes other than one of the purposes under the Act, the Commission's position is the employer has complied? MR. PORTER: Yes. MR. ZWEIG: And you don't need two buckets of time? MR. PORTER: Correct. Okay, all right. MR. ZWEIG: DIRECTOR ASHLEY: I would encourage

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

 $\sqrt{12}$ 

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

you to continue to work with the Labor Division and the Legal Division as well and provide additional details to that. I imagine you've already provided something in writing? MR. ZWEIG: We have. DIRECTOR ASHLEY: I would encourage that --MR. ZWEIG: Okay. DIRECTOR ASHLEY: -- to continue to elaborate upon this. And I want to thank you for your Out of respect for everybody that's here, we're going to have to move on to the next speaker. ZWEIG: Absolutely. Thank you MR. for being so generous with me and so responsive, and we are working together on this and realize we're dealing with what the voters passed; but it is causing a lot of angst and confusion out there, so thank you. DIRECTOR ASHLEY: Thank you, and we definitely recognize and appreciate that. The author of the Prop 206 gave it to the voters, the voters gave it to us, and that's where we are. Thank you very much. MR. ZWEIG: MR. PORTER: Thank you. Our next commenter will be Heidi Nunn Gilman.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

 $\sqrt{12}$ 

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. GILMAN: Good morning. First, I'd like to say thank you for your time and being diligent to address these important matters and clarify ambiguities for both the employers and the employees so the employees get the time that they're supposed to under this law and the employers aren't overly burdened with additional requirement.

I think a lot of the concerns that I'm hearing are similar to what Denise and Jay have heard. One clarification, payment of commission and piece-rate where it's the hourly rate of pay agreed upon by employer and employee prior -- previously established, is that going to allow the employer to establish a rate in its policy to say, you know, piece-rate workers will receive \$18 an hour when they use this leave?

What actually is meant by "employer and employee agreed upon rate"?

And then under the subsection (iv)
there where if all else fails, you do a weighted
average of all hourly rates of pay, I have had some
confusion among that because they say, "But my
commissioned person doesn't have an hourly rate of
pay. My piece-rate person doesn't have an hourly rate
of pay."

So I believe the intent here is that you take their piece rate and convert it to an hourly average, but I think there's -- some people are a little bit confused about that.

 $\sqrt{12}$ 

Also, to follow up on Denise's comment on the definition of "available," the law requires that with your paycheck you list the leave available, the leave used and then the money paid for it. So does "available" mean 40 hours if I have 60 in my bank because I've rolled over 20 from last year? Or does it mean 40 hours because my employer's policy says 40 hours is all I can take?

And then as far as if I have a PTO program, what goes on my paycheck? Is that going to be satisfied if I have the same information, but instead of earned paid sick time available it says paid time off available, and my policy has expressed that it covers all of those paid time off?

We would recommend that that be clarified, maybe in a regulation. The whole issue of paid time off has been, I think, the biggest confusion in all of this because the employers are see -- or employees, the employees are seeing the poster and they're seeing a list of their rights to this earned paid sick time, and there's nothing in the notices

that gives them information that a PTO program can satisfy this requirement. That's completely left up to the employer to do all of the messaging.

1.4

It might help both the employee and the employer if the notifications -- either the poster or the notice -- the form notice that you give at the time of hire were to have some sort of information to the employee saying inpaid sick -- unpaid time off policy can satisfy this requirement.

carry-over, again, is a -- is a big one. The regulations, we definitely appreciate you trying to limit carry-over so someone doesn't have 160 hours and can only use 40 and are -- are wondering why. So that was really beneficial, but the regs say the carry-over does not affect the accrual rights. We think it should also clarify it doesn't affect the limitations of usage when you roll that over.

And then, again, we're getting questions on the reinstatement of hours if they're rehired and, particularly, again, how this rollover will impact that.

So if an employee has 60 hours because they've rolled some over, they're let go, six months later they come back, it says you're supposed to reinstate their paid sick leave. Do you have to

reinstate the full 60 hours, even though they can only 2 use 40 and they're going to start accruing and going 3 to use less than that? Or can you limit the 4 reinstatement to 40 hours, similar to limiting the 5 rollover to 40 hours? 6 And then if you -- if you have a 7 policy that pays out at the end, even though you're 8 not required to, how does that impact the 9 reinstatement, because I've already paid for the value 10 of that time? 11 So I think those are some of the 12 outstanding issues to still be addressed regarding the 13 carry-over; and there are additional comments that we 14 have submitted in writing, but those are things 15 that -- that kind of came up, and if you have any 16 questions I'm happy to. . . 17 MR. PORTER: Any questions? 18 MS. HAYDEN: Thank you. We have received all of the written comments which you 19 20 submitted and appreciate your time. 2.1 MS. GILMAN: Thank you. 22 MR. PORTER: Thank you very much. 23 Our next comment will be -- and I apologize if I'm mispronouncing this -- Sandra 24 25 Portney.

MS. PORTNEY: Portney.

MR. PORTER: Portney.

MS. PORTNEY: Thank you so much for hearing our comments. There's been a lot of confusion, a lot of talk on the street, a lot of rumors about how things are going to work and happen; and one of the big things, and I think people have addressed it, and I think maybe this -- getting some clarification when we talk about employees that already have a paid time off policy that's more generous than the statute allows for, are they allowed to carve it out, in a sense, to say, "Here's our paid sick time policy, and here's our paid time off policy"?

We've talked -- there's been a lot of talk about how to track it on your paycheck by specifically calling it two different categories, but the concern is, is if I'm offering 80 hours, does this statute apply to all 80 hours or can we carve out 40 of those hours and have those applicable to the statute and the other 40 hours kind of sit with just the employee's policies? And that's, I think, what a lot of people would like to have some clarification on.

The second thing is with respect to

employers that -- once again, you know, it's great if you don't have this policy in place. It's easy to start. Where the confusion comes in is to employers that have had the policies, some more generous, mostly all more generous.

<sup>2</sup>25

If you use a year-end date like the employee's anniversary, and let's say an employee started on January 2nd and they're full-time, technically they might accrue a substantial amount of hours based on the 30 hours -- one hour for every 30 hours. You're looking at 66.67, 67 hours per year that you can accrue.

So July 1st is the date this starts. How do you deal with an employer that's been accruing hours during the year? Do we need to reset at July 1st and say one for every 30?

So, technically, I think the number was 37 hours or 32 hours is what they would accrue for this half of the year. The minimum's 40. So how do we comply? Do we have to give them additional hours on top of what we've given them prior to the application of the statute?

MR. PORTER: So we -- we have -- there's an FAQ that seeks to answer the question of what should employers who have their year -- their

selective year doesn't begin on July 1st. If an employer's year begins on July 1st, then that's easy.

That's one earned paid sick time kicks in.

For an employer who, let's say, their year begins on January 1st, so they're halfway through when the time earned paid sick time comes into play, are they required to allow employees to accrue the same time amount of time that an employee could accrue during an entire year?

And we've addressed this in a way that we're trying to be fair to all employees and employers, regardless of what you're selected year is, and that's simply to prorate the maximum amount of time that an employee can accrue by the amount of that's left in an employer's year.

So it's, you know, for -- just for sake of ease, if there's 50 percent of a year and it's an employee who works for an employer with 15 or more employees, they would be entitled to accrue and use up to 40 hours in a full year. But because they only have 50 percent of the year left, they would be entitled to accrue and use in that, you know, initial six-month period half of that, so 20 hours.

MS. PORTNEY: Twenty hours, yeah.

MR. PORTER: And then their year

would begin again on -- on January 1st and -- and it would start over. But you -- you may even have employers who don't operate on a July 1st to July 4th -- 1st or January 1st to January 1st.

In those situations, there's a few examples in that FAQ, you know, that basically explain you do the number of days left in your year after July 1st divided by 365 and -- and do the math, and you can calculate the maximum amount that an employer -- an employee should be able to accrue used in that partial year.

MS. PORTNEY: Fair enough.

MR. PORTER: But for employees that -- that FAQ doesn't address the question of employees who are hired after the beginning of the year. For that issue, our FA -- our FAQ states that an employer should allow an employee to accrue time as -- as the statute requires and, you know, if they begin in month eleven of a year, then they would be entitled to accrue as much time as they could and use that time that they're accruing in those final two months.

If they, you know, begin at the six-month mark, they would be entitled to accrue as much time as they could, pursuant to the formula in

the Act for those -- for those six months. So you wouldn't do any sort of proration for employees that begin after the employer's year begins.

MS. PORTNEY: Sure.

MR. PORTER: Does that make sense?

MS. PORTNEY: Yes, absolutely.

Now, on the first one, on the clarification on the carve-out, is that appropriate to carve out the paid sick time in 40 hours and then any other hours as a paid time off not applicable to the statute?

MR. PORTER: I think my initial reaction would be "yes." As long as an employer is meeting the minimum requirements of the Fair Wages and Healthy Families Act, they can do anything in excess of that.

So if an employer offers their employees 80 hours, as long as they're offering 40 hours pursuant to the requirements of Prop 206, it would meet the minimum requirement.

If an employer wanted to carve out those additional 40 hours for other purposes and say that an employee can't use those additional 40 hours for earned paid sick time purposes, they could certainly do that, as long as they've met the minimum

requirements of the Act.

MS. PORTNEY: Well, the -- the question is so -- is more related to the application of the -- the -- the rules that state if somebody is fired, there's a presumption for 90 days that they were fired because of use of the paid sick time. So, clearly, all employers want to get that 40 hours done as fast as they can.

Now, I know there's a lot of talk about how you deal with those hours. For instance, if an employee calls up and says -- you know, some -- some employers are using a code. "If you want to use paid sick time, you know, state this code and no questions asked." If you want to use another, you have to -- you know, you have maybe notice requirement.

So they don't want some of the application of -- of the rules of the statute to apply to paid time off. For instance, one of my employers wants a two-week notice on paid time off, but paid sick time doesn't allow that.

So if you've used those 40 hours on paid sick time and somebody doesn't provide notice, they want to know can they fire that person with respect to not showing up based on not sick time

2 MR. PORTER: Yeah --3 PORTNEY: And that's --MS. 4 MR. PORTER: -- that's a very good 5 You know, we've -- we've heard a lot from question. 6 employers on the presumption and the requirement that 7 there be clear and convincing evidence to overcome the 8 presumption. But, again, that was in Prop 206 and the 9 voters passed Prop 206 and handed it to the Industrial 10 Commission to enforce. 11 Some of the written comments we 12 received have asked us to eliminate that provision. 13 Unfortunately, the Industrial Commission doesn't have 14 authority to change the legislation that the voters 15 passed, and so we hear the concerns from employers 16 about that presumption and how to overcome that 17 presumption but unfortunately --18 MS. PORTNEY: That's the carve-out 19 and that's -- as long as we can do the carve-out, I 20 think we'll feel more comfortable with doing that. With you guys just saying, "Yes, we're good with the 21 22 carve-out," then I think a lot of employers are going to start doing the carve-out. 23 24 MR. PORTER: Yeah, so we're 25 certainly -- we're happy to take a closer look at that

anymore, but paid time off.

1

1 question that you posed, and to the extent that --2 that we can provide further guidance to employers in our FAQs, we'll certainly do that. 3 4 MS. PORTNEY: Thank you so much. 5 MR. PORTER: You bet. 6 Our next commenter will be Debra 7 Novak-Scott. 8 MS. NOVAK-SCOTT: Thank you. Ι 9 mostly have clarification questions. Our attorneys 10 with Martin Bonnett supposedly sent you a brief, also. 11 We have a question on carry-over. Wе 12 represent Unit 3 employees in the City of Phoenix and 13 it's been -- I've been there over 30 years, but it's 14 been a longtime practice of the City that you earn 15 your sick leave, and then you can carry it over to the 16 next year. 17 On the clarification, we don't see 18 anything in this law that limits the carry-over to 19 only 40 hours. How will that be handled for employers 20 like the City of Phoenix that allow employees to carry over more than 40 hours? 2.1 22 MR. PORTER: Yeah. So, again, the 23 Act allows employers to be more generous than the 24 minimum requirements; and in our proposed rule on 25 carry-over we're seeking to provide some guidance,

again, as to the minimum requirement for carry-over. 1 2 Employers that choose to allow 3 employees to carry over excess hours can certainly do that, as long as the minimum requirements of the Act 4 are being satisfied. 5 So Prop 206 doesn't MS. NOVAK-SCOTT: 6 7 require that there's a separate 40-hour bank? could be just lumped in with the employee's current 8 earned sick leave? 9 10 PORTER: As long as -- and I think you're referring to maybe a PTO policy? 11 MS. NOVAK-SCOTT: We don't have PTO. 12 13 I mean, we have -- we literally have sick leave, vacation, and then compensatory time. 14 So is your question can 15 MR. PORTER: 16 an employer -- can that employer lump in earned paid sick time into the sick leave policy? 17 Is that your question? 18 Well, what they're 19 MS. NOVAK-SCOTT: proposing -- and, actually, we are asking because 20 21 Human Resources is having a meeting that started at They're taking the 40 hours and they're 22 9:30 on this. 23 just going to include it as part of the current earned 24 sick leave from employees, and we don't know if that's 25 the correct interpretation of the law or if it's

supposed to be an additional 40 hours that's protected.

MR. PORTER: So I think our FAQs, again, address the question of can an employer offer a bank of time for reasons -- for earned paid sick time purposes, as outlined by Proposition 206, and also provide for additional uses of that time? And the Industrial Commission has indicated that an employer can do that.

So an employer wouldn't be required to take, you know, its sick time, vacation time and other times and then add on another 40-hour requirement. If they wanted to revise their sick time policy, as long as that policy meets the minimum requirements of the Act, then that policy would -- would satisfy the Act for earned paid sick time purposes.

So a sick time policy that allows employees to accrue and use time pursuant to the Act would -- would meet the requirements of -- of the Act, as well as the regulations.

Does that answer your question?

MS. NOVAK-SCOTT: I believe so.

I have another question, because we talked to other cities. They aren't imposing any

restrictions on any of the earned sick leave. So thev know that under the law it's just the 40 hours that's protected, but just -- I guess for the ease of dealing with it, they're allowing all earned sick leave to be considered protected, which means, you know, employees are not subject to discipline. Is that something that's in the FAQs also that we missed? I -- I don't believe so. MR. PORTER: MS. NOVAK-SCOTT: Okay. So that's kind of up to each city's prerogative, what they want to do? MR. PORTER: As -- as far as whether they want to create a separate bank that's only earned paid sick time and it's subject to the anti-retaliation provision, is that your question, whether cities can do that? MS. NOVAK-SCOTT: No. So all the law So if other is concerned about is that 40 hours. cities, like Mesa or whoever decide, "Hey, we're just not going get into this. We're going to allow all their earned sick leave to be considered protected under the law," is that -- I mean, they can do that, obviously, but is that something that is probably a good idea under the law?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PORTER: I don't know that we can comment on whether it's a good idea, but I -- I think that it would be permissible for an employer to do anything that's more generous than the minimum requirements of the Act. If they want to allow their employees to have more time than is required by the minimum requirements of the Act, they can do that; and if they want to designate that time as protected earned paid sick time, they can certainly do that as well. MS. NOVAK-SCOTT: Or they can also just carve out that 40 hours and say, "This part's protected, and then when you use the rest of your earned sick leave you could be subject to an attendance policy"? Yeah, as long as that --PORTER: as long as the minimum requirements of the Act -- and to be clear, we're talking about 40 hours in -- in this situation. This is for an employer who has 15 or The numbers are different for smaller more employees. employers. Okay, thank you. MS. NOVAK-SCOTT: MR. PORTER: You're welcome. The last comment I have -- and if

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

there are additional comment sheets, feel free to pass

```
1
   them up.
             Our last speaker that I have here is Heidi
   Kolton.
3
                     MS. KOLTON:
                                  Yes.
4
                     Good morning.
5
                     MR. PORTER:
                                  Morning.
6
                     MS.
                         KOLTON:
                                  I'm just looking for a
7
   clarification, and I think this question was posed by
8
        I -- I have a few clients that are -- have
   commissioned -- I'm going back to the commissioned
9
10
   salesperson.
                A commissioned salesperson with higher
11
   value items, cars, art, designs, they might not sell
12
   every month.
13
                     So their, you know, earnings are --
14
   maybe they come up with commissions being paid every
15
   six months, and I have one client where they might
16
   make -- every four months they're paid a commission.
17
                     How does one average to come out --
18
   income average to come out with an hourly rate for the
19
   paid sick time?
20
                     MR. PORTER:
                                  Yeah, and I think
21
   Mr. Zweig, if I'm saying that right --
22
                     MS. KOLTON:
                                  Yes, yes, that was --
23
   it's near and dear to our heart but --
24
                     MR. PORTER:
                                  Yeah, and I -- I think
25
   one of his concerns was if commissioned employees
```

aren't keeping track of their hours, how are you able to do a --

MS. KOLTON: I think they should.

MR. PORTER: Well, I guess after

Mr. Zweig sat down, commissioned employees are still required to be paid pursuant to minimum wage law. So if the commissioned employee isn't keeping track of their hours, I'm not sure how an employer is ensuring that the requirements of minimum wage are being satisfied.

I think the intent in the language of the proposed rulemaking was, again, to make it easier for employers that have commissioned employees to figure out what rate of pay they use for earned paid sick time, and if all of the other -- the first three provisions fail, we thought that it would make sense to just do a time weighted average.

But, again, that would assume that an employer is keeping track of the number of hours to take the pay that that commissioned employee has received over a 90-day period, divide it by the number of hours to come up with a reasonable rate of pay to use for earned paid sick time, keeping in mind that in that week that the employee is -- let's say they use an entire week for earned paid sick time purposes.

```
1
   Maybe they wouldn't have made any commissions that
   week or maybe they would have made their highest
2
3
   commissions that they made during their employment.
4
                     MS. KOLTON:
                                   Right.
5
                         PORTER:
                     MR.
                                   We simply don't know;
6
   and so, again, the intent of the Commission here was
7
   to provide some clarity and assist employers who have
8
   commissioned employees on figuring out what a
9
   reasonable rate of pay should be.
10
                     For those employers that don't use --
11
   or keep track of the hours of their commissioned
   employees, you can see how that would be a little
12
13
   difficult; but, again, for minimum wage purposes, I
14
   believe that employers are required to keep track of
15
   those hours to ensure that their employees are meeting
16
   the requirements of the minimum wage laws so. . .
17
                     MS.
                         KOLTON:
                                   Thank you.
18
                     MR.
                         PORTER:
                                   You bet.
19
                     Our next commenter will be Chris
20
   Winkler.
21
                     MR.
                         WINKLER:
                                    Good morning, thank you
22
   for your time.
23
                     MR. PORTER:
                                   Morning.
24
                     MR.
                         WINKLER:
                                    I have a question
25
   that's kind of a little bit totally different than
```

what everybody else has been asking. I work in the healthcare industry, and we have a kind of unique set of employees within healthcare and human services that does not have the same kind of work scheduling that most regular employees would have. What I'm talking about is the use of relief or on-call staff.

Employers in healthcare or human services utilize staff to fill in when regularly-scheduled staff would not be available. So if you're providing services to, for example, folks with developmental disabilities or elder care, there are needs that need to be met. So there can't be a set schedule. These folks might need services 24 hours a day.

When a regularly-scheduled staff takes paid sick time that's granted by the law, there is a need to put another staff in place there; and so employers like myself will utilize a pool of on-call staff who have no set schedule, who only work when they choose to work, when shifts are available.

Under the guidance of the law and the facts that are out there, this employee who chooses to work one day a month, five days a month, three days a week every week, would then be granted one hour of paid sick time for every 30 hours that they work.

then utilize that time? They would almost need to schedule themselves to work in order to call off sick, and so that's something I'm hoping that the Commission can provide some guidance into how to deal with and address those situations and potentially look at that type of class of employee as not -- maybe not even required under law be granted such leave time because they don't have a schedule to work and they don't have any requirements to report to work except for when they choose to based on their availability and their decision to want to work.

Is there any --

MR. PORTER: Yeah, it's a question that -- that I haven't thought about before. So I appreciate you bringing it to our attention. The Act defines an employee, and we need to follow that -- that definition.

MR. WINKLER: Uh-huh.

MR. PORTER: The Commission doesn't have liberty to redefine the term "employee" to exclude a certain class of employees. So if these -- if this pool of workers are employees of a business and they provide services, they would be entitled to the protections of the Act, including the accrual of

earned paid sick time.

2.1

Logistically speaking, how they would use that is a more difficult question. You know, perhaps if -- if an employee from that pool is requested to come in and, you know, becomes ill or a family member becomes ill or another of the usage requirements of the Act are satisfied, they could use their earned paid sick time for that, even though it's a -- they're only working occasionally.

But it's a good question. We're certainly willing to take a look at it and see if we can provide some further guidance to employers that have that sort of scenario.

MR. WINKLER: Okay. Yeah, because what I can see is, again, in my field where I need to have an employee on duty for that hour, if I've had somebody who's requested time off for legitimate causes under paid sick policies or paid vacation or sick time and a staff agrees to work that on an on-call basis but then calls in sick, I have to go find yet another person who could call in sick an hour before the shift, and I may end up paying four people to work one hour.

My company deals with developmental disabilities, which is a field that does not have a

```
1
   lot of funding to begin with. Paid sick time and
 2
   paying four to five times to give one hour of service,
 3
   and we're only paid based on that one hour of service,
   can end up creating quite the financial hardship
 4
 5
   that's well above and beyond just the basic paid sick
   time practices, which -- which my organization already
 6
7
   more than addressed, and we're not concerned about
   that with our regular staffing.
 8
 9
                     So it would be very nice to have some
   further guidance as to how to address that.
10
11
                     MR. PORTER:
                                  Happy to look at it, and
   we have -- we have your information so
13
                         WINKLER:
                                   Sure, and I did submit
   a written comment as well directed at this exact
15
   issue.
1.6
                     MR.
                         PORTER:
                                  Thank you very much.
                     MR.
                         WINKLER:
                                   Thank you.
18
                     MR.
                         PORTER:
                                  Our next commenter will
19
   be Jill Chas-on, Chase-on.
20
                     MS. CHASSON:
                                  Bonus points for
   getting it right the first time.
21
22
                     Thank you very much.
                                            Mr. Winkler
   actually covered one of my questions, which was
23
24
   exactly about on-call relief, per diem workers.
                                                       Wе
25
   represent quite a few employers in the healthcare
```

12

14

17

industry and that's a big concern for them, in particular, whether someone in that kind of role could at least be limited to using paid sick time only for hours they were otherwise already scheduled to work.

2.1

You know, the idea that someone in that kind of role could simply call up and say, "Hey, I'd like to use one of my paid sick time hours today," when they're not otherwise scheduled to work is causing some concern.

MR. PORTER: Okay.

MS. CHASSON: So that was one.

Another question related to a similar -- that same classification of employees, these healthcare employers also have people who sometimes move from a full-time PTO eligible role where they have a bank of PTO time that's usable for any purpose and the (inaudible) requirements into a pier diem or on-call role or some other role where they're not eligible for PTO and they wouldn't get that time, and in those situations when they move to the non-PTO eligible role, the employer's practice has been to cash out all of the PTO and pay it to the employee.

So the question has arisen in that situation, may an employer still cash out all of the

PTO down to zero or must they leave some time available for this employee in a bank that would be usable for paid sick time purposes?

1.3

MR. PORTER: So at the end of a year where you have a PTO policy that has hours that can be used for purposes beyond that prescribed by the Act and an employer chooses to cash out at the end -- or can an employer cash out --

MS. CHASSON: It's actually a slightly different situation. It's not the end of the year. If an employee moves from, say, a full-time 40-hour-a-week job into one of these on-call, per diem roles that historically has not been eligible for any kind of paid time off for the reasons Mr. Winkler alluded to, that the practice has been to take any PTO that that person accrued in a (inaudible) and pay it out to them so that they then have no PTO or paid time off of any time available.

These people would now be covered by a paid sick time program, but the question has arisen whether it's still permissible to pay out all of the approved PTO down to zero or do we need to approach it like a year-end situation where if you cash them out, you then have to give them an amount of time that they would immediately be eligible for, and this may not be

1 occurring at the end of the year. 2 MR. PORTER: Yeah, so I -- I don't 3 think that the Act addresses that question. 4 MS. CHASSON: It doesn't. 5 PORTER: Yeah, it doesn't. It. provides for kind of a cash out at the end of a year. 6 7 It states that an employer at the time of separation 8 of an employee is not required to pay out the employee 9 for any bank of accrued or unpaid sick time they have; 10 but it does not, to my knowledge, authorize an 11 employee to do some sort of cash out or transition of 12 earned paid sick time mid-year. 13 So as long as an employee is 14 remaining an employee, although they may go from one 15 capacity where they're full-time to an on-call type 16 position, we're certainly happy to look at this 17 further; but it would seem to me that an employer 18 would be required to allow that employee to continue 19 to have access to any accrued earned paid sick time 20 that they had prior to that transition for the 21 remainder of that year. 22 But we're certainly happy to give 23 that question some more thought and potentially update 24 FAQs to address it. <sup>#</sup>25 MS. CHASSON: So if -- let's say one

of these employees had 80 hours accrued in their PTO bank and they move to a position where they're no longer eligible for that, does the employer pay out 40 of those hours or leave 40 in the bank? Can they pay out all 80 and start them accruing at the one hour of sick time for 30 hours of work?

2.

MR. PORTER: So the -- the second part of your question, could they pay them out for the entire 80, I don't believe so if it's mid-year. Could they pay them out for that portion of the 80 hours that does not represent earned paid sick time, I think they could do that because that would be in excess of the requirements of the Act.

But the amount of -- of the time in that 80 hours that's earned paid sick time and subject to the provisions of the Act, the employee has accrued that and is entitled to use it for the remainder of the -- year, the employer's year, and so if there's some transition in work during the year, the employee should be entitled to continue to have that.

I think that -- that will be the answer, but we're certainly happy to look at that question further; and to the extent that you have suggestions on how that should be handled pursuant to the Act, we'd certainly invite you to submit your com

-- your thoughts, even if it's outside the context of the -- the rulemaking.

MS. CHASSON: Right.

MR. PORTER: If you have comments on FAQs and things like that.

MS. CHASSON: Yeah. No, our working assumption is that they should not pay them out all the way down to zero.

MR. PORTER: Okay.

MS. CHASSON: One last question on a different subject. The Act itself requires employees to make a good faith effort to provide notice of the paid sick time if it's somewhat foreseeable and then allows employers to implement notice requirements for unforeseeable leave, but neither the Act nor the proposed regulations address whether consequences are permissible if the employee doesn't comply with the notice requirements.

And under the FMLA, for example, an employee who does not comply with the notice requirements, an employer's permitted to deny leave or to at least deny his FMLA; and I think it would be helpful if guidance could be provided to employers clarifying whether if an employee doesn't comply with their notice requirements, whether the time can be

```
denied.
 1
 2
                     MR.
                          PORTER:
                                   Okay, we'll happily look
 3
   at that.
 4
                     MS.
                         CHASSON:
                                    Thank you.
 5
                     MR. PORTER:
                                   You bet.
 6
                     Our next commenter -- and I know I'm
 7
   going to mispronounce this -- Frank Piccioli.
 8
                     MR. PICCIOLI:
                                     Piccioli, close.
                                                        Νo
 9
   one ever gets it right. It's those Italian names,
10
   too.
11
                     My name's Frank Piccioli.
   president of AFSCME Local 2960, City of Phoenix.
12
   question is concerning the caps. I'm not a lawyer,
13
   but I couldn't find anything in the law that said that
14
   there's a cap. I see minimums, and then in the
15
   Frequently Asked Questions -- and I think the City is
16
   doing this as well -- you can earn 40, you can carry
17
18
   over 40 with a maximum of 80.
19
                     So, for instance, when no one uses
20
   use that amount of sick leave in a three-year period,
   my interpretation from the Frequently Asked Questions
2.1
22
   is, no, you have a maximum of 80, and I just don't
    know where that is in the -- in the law that says
23
24
   there's caps. I see minimums.
                                     I don't see maximums.
<sup>#</sup>25
                         PORTER:
                     MR.
                                   So, again, an employer
```

is permitted to do whatever they want above -- as long as they're meeting the minimum requirements of the Act.

MR. PICCIOLI: So in a three-year period, for instance, is that 120 hours -- if they don't use anything, a minimum of 40 a year, right, I mean, if you're a full-time employee and earn sick leave, can you use 120 or -- because I thought I read something about it being maxed.

MR. PORTER: So the statute has minimum requirements, and for an employer that has 15 or more employees, the minimum requirement is that employees are permitted to accrue and use 40 hours in a calendar year.

employee to, you know, accrue 40 in this year and roll it over to the next year, and then they have 80 after the end of year two and then they have 120 after the end of year three and 160 at the end of year four, and wants to allow the employee to use that time whenever they want to up to the entire 160 or whatever they get.

MR. PICCIOLI: Right.

MR. PORTER: They're certainly entitled to do that because it would exceed the

```
requirements of the Act; but if the employer wants to
1
2
   only do the minimum, they would be required to allow
3
   the employees -- again, I'm speaking in the context of
4
   15 or more employees --
 5
                    MR. PICCIOLI:
                                    Sure.
6
                    MR.
                         PORTER:
                                 -- to accrue 40 hours,
7
   to carry over 40 hours so that that's immediately
8
              So a hypothetical, if an employee works an
   available.
9
   entire calendar year, accrues 40 hours in year one and
   doesn't use any of that, they would be entitled to
10
11
   carry over that 40 hours to the year two so it would
   be immediately available. They would then be entitled
12
13
   to continue to accrue during the period of year two.
14
   So at the end of year two, they would have 80 hours.
15
                    Now, keep in mind an employer can
   restrict an employee's use in year two to 40 hours
16
17
                    MR. PICCIOLI:
                                    Right.
18
                    MR.
                         PORTER:
                                 -- even though they --
19
   their bank may be 80 hours, and then at the end of
20
   year two carry over 40, you know, subject to ongoing
2.1
   approval.
22
                    MR. PICCIOLI:
                                    So you carry over, but
   only 40, you're saying, is protected every year?
23
24
                    MR. PORTER:
                                  Again, so that the Act
25
   is focused on the minimum requirements of an employer.
```

Employees are permitted to be more generous in any respect than the Act requires.

MR. PICCIOLI: So if it doesn't lead -- if it doesn't cap it and if the law doesn't require a maximum, then why are we saying only 40? Why are we saying it's only 40 every year, because in the law it says minimum? I could understand if the law said up to, you know, a maximum of 40. It just says minimum of 40.

MR. PORTER: And you're speaking to the proposed -- the language in the proposed rule?

MR. PICCIOLI: Correct.

MR. PORTER: So we received some written comments, and that's an issue that we'll be looking at to clarify that, again, our -- to the extent applicable, our proposed rules are also designed to set the minimum bar for employees -- for employers; and if the employer wants to go above and beyond, they certainly can.

So we didn't intend in our proposed rule to say that employees under all circumstances are restricted to 40 hours carry-over. That would be the minimum requirement under those circumstances, but if an employer that wants to permit employees to carry over in excess of 40 hours and to use in excess of 40

```
1
   hours in a prescribed year can do so.
 2
                     MR. PICCIOLI: Okay.
                                            Great, thank
 3
   you.
 4
                     MR. PORTER:
                                  You bet.
 5
                     Our next commenter Abe -- Abe Arvizu,
 6
   Jr.
 7
                     MR. ARVIZU:
                                  I just wanted to say
 8
   exactly what Frank said.
 9
                     MR. PORTER:
                                  If you can't come down
   the stairs, we can bring the recorder up.
10
11
   want to make sure that we get your comments on the
   recorder.
12
13
                     MR. ARVIZU:
                                  Okay. Abe Arvizu, Jr.
14
   I'm the vice president of AFSCME Local 2384,
15
   blue-collar workers for the City of Phoenix.
   exactly what Frank was saying. Neither we could find
16
17
   anywhere that states a maximum. So, for the record,
18
   we were hoping that you would reconsider that and take
19
   that into consideration when you review what you have,
20
   the comments that have been submitted.
21
                     MR. PORTER:
                                  Happy to do so.
22
                     MR. ARVIZU:
                                  Thank you.
23
                     MR. PORTER:
                                  Thank you.
24
                     This was -- Mr. Arvizu was the last
25
                     Is there anyone else in the group who
   comment I have.
```

```
1
   would like to make any comments?
2
                     DIRECTOR ASHLEY:
                                       We have one more
3
   slip to pick up.
4
                     MR. PORTER:
                                  All right.
                                               Our last
   comment, subject to anyone else that would like to
5
6
   make a comment, is Jennifer Grondahl.
7
                     MS. GRONDAHL:
                                    Yes.
                                           Thank you for
8
   allowing me.
                  I apologize. I came from the City's
9
   meeting.
10
                     MR.
                        PORTER:
                                  Don't worry about it.
11
                     MS. GRONDAHL:
                                    I work in two states.
   I work in California and I work in Arizona, and I
12
13
   represent government employees in both states.
14
                     As you are aware, the proposition and
15
   law that passed in California that the Governor signed
   here is very similar to the one in Arizona, and it is
16
17
   our opinion that the 40 hour minumum, which we are
18
   extremely thankful for, I think the voters have chosen
19
   correctly in passing that proposition here; but time
20
   that is beyond the 40 hours would also be protected
   from disciplinary action or termination, and that is
21
22
   our concern with the way it's understood and written.
23
                     I had a very brief comment.
24
                     MR. PORTER: Okay, thank you very
25
   much.
```

Are there any other comments?

All right, then I'll turn the time

3 over to our Director.

2.4

<sup>2</sup>25

DIRECTOR ASHLEY: We just wanted to thank everyone for being here this morning. This is an important part of the process and important feedback that we're receiving.

Proposition 206 did not require us to engage in rulemaking. It specifically stated we could engage in guidelines or rulemaking. We chose to engage in rulemaking to add clarity, clarity to the process, additional transparencies to the process, and then also to provide you with enough opportunity to provide additional feedback.

And with that next step in the process, with the feedback we've received over the last 30 days, the feedback we've received today at this hearing, and then additional feedback as a reminder prior to the deadline at 5:00 p.m. today to submit written feedback to our Labor Division, the next step in the process there will likely be changes to the proposed rulemaking based on all this public feedback that we've received.

So there will be a Notice of Supplemental Proposed Rulemaking that will be posted

on our website, and there will also be the opening of another 30-day public comment hearing similar to the last 30 days that will culminate in another oral hearing, just like this one, 30 days after the opening of that process.

We will have this information posted on the home page on the website near the prominent icon for the Frequently Asked Questions; and on the note of the Frequently Asked Questions, continue to watch for additional updates on the FAQs based on feedback, based on additional questions that come to mind.

The FAQ started as a core list of questions that we felt you'd have concerns about. It grew based on your feedback. You wanted to -- to learn more about other aspects of this law. So we have grown that and will continue to do that, and we do have a few copies in the back, although a very printer-friendly PDF version is also available directly on the website.

So we would like to thank you all very much for being here, and this concludes this public hearing.

(Whereupon the proceedings were concluded at 10:16 a.m.)

## CERTIFICATE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the proceedings had upon the foregoing hearing are contained in the shorthand record made by me thereof, and that the foregoing pages constitute a full, true, and correct transcript of said shorthand record; all done to the best of my skill and ability.

DATED at Phoenix, Arizona this 15th day of June, 2017.

Certified Court Reporter

Ter vere

I CERTIFY that Verbatim Reporting has complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-201. Dated at Phoenix, Arizona, this 15th day of June, 2017.

<sup>2</sup>25

Verbatim Reporting Arizona RRF No. R1050

Verbatin Reporting